

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ELFIDA RAMIREZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

COSTCO WHOLESALE
CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:24-cv-01432-JLT-EPG

ORDER FOR ATTORNEY BUZZARD TO
SHOW CAUSE WHY SANCTIONS SHOULD
NOT ISSUE FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY
WITH COURT ORDER TO ATTEND THE
MANDATORY SCHEDULING
CONFERENCE

(ECF No. 3)

On November 22, 2024, the Court issued an order setting a mandatory scheduling conference for February 25, 2025. (ECF No. 3). The order warned as follows: “Should counsel or a party appearing *pro se* fail to appear at the Mandatory Scheduling Conference . . . an *ex parte* hearing may be held and contempt sanctions, including monetary sanctions, dismissal, default, or other appropriate judgment, may be imposed and/or ordered.” (*Id.* at 6).

On February 21, 2025, Defendant filed a scheduling report, with only Defendant’s position as to scheduling, that contained this footnote: “Counsel for Defendant had attempted to meet and confer with Plaintiff’s counsel. Plaintiff’s counsel was not available, therefore Defendant files this statement.” (ECF No. 8, p. 1). The Court held the conference as scheduled on February 25, 2025, and counsel for Defendant appeared. However, Attorney Robert Buzzard, counsel for Plaintiff, did not appear. The Court’s courtroom deputy tried to reach Plaintiff’s counsel but was unsuccessful. Accordingly, the Court noted that it would issue an order to show cause due to counsel’s failure to appear and it did not issue a scheduling order.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. Attorney Robert Buzzard shall show cause why sanctions should not issue for counsel's failure to attend the conference as required by the Court's order. (ECF No. 3).
2. Attorney Buzzard has seven days from the entry of this order to file a written response explaining why counsel did not attend the conference.
3. After reviewing counsel's response, the Court will further consider whether sanctions are appropriate and whether to schedule the case.
4. A failure to respond to this order may resulting in dismissal of the case for failure to prosecute and to comply with a court order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **February 25, 2025**

/s/ Eric P. Grogan
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE